DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 141 EA 022 875

AUTHOR Logiudice, Angelo J.
TITLE Some Effects on Beliefs about Work Performance of Administrators of Different Sex, Sexual Preference and Administrative Locus.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, February 16, 1991). Appendixes (the greater part of the document) contain "filled" type. Tables in Appendix C contain small, faint type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Characteristics; *Attitude Measures; Beliefs; Disclosure; Elementary Secondary Education; *Homosexuality; Individual Characteristics; Q Methodology; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Sexual Orientation

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a study in which 96 administrators, 4 authorities, 5 experts, and 16 individuals were sampled to isolate and identify some typologies of belief that administrators may have toward gay people in the workplace and to see how those typologies are affected by sex, sexual preference, and worksetting. A detailed description of the Q methodology used in the study is followed by four general findings: (1) some gay people were not as open as expected toward disclosure regarding their beliefs toward gay people in the workplace; (2) both straight and lesbian females were more open to disclosure on gay rights issues in the workplace; (3) some antigay sentiment among some administrators' beliefs was found in both gay and straight respondents; (4) business and academic administrators had positive attitudes toward gay people, although some remained homophobic. Practical and theoretical implications of the study conclude the document. Appended are a master list of Q-sort item statements used and 27 tables. (CLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331141

Some Effects on Beliefs About Work Performance of Administrators of Different Sex, Sexual Preference and Administrative Locus

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presented at the
Eastern Educational Research Conference
Marriott Hotel
Boston, MA
February 16, 1991

Angelo J. Logiudice, Ed.D.

EA 022 875

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Logiudice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

	Page
Purpose of the Study	1
Methodology	1
Pilot Study	2
Analyses	3
Results - Tests of Hypotheses	5
Study Findings	13
Practical Implications	13
Theoretical Implications	14
Appendixes	
A. Master List Q-Sort Item Statements	17
B. Correlations For Test-Retest Reliability	26
C. Tables for Factor Scores of Positive and Negative Discriminators for Factors One, Two, Three, and Four	29
D. Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests Among Mean Scores for Research Question One: Effects for Differences by Sex of Administrator	34
E. Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests Among Mean Scores for Research Question Two: Effects for Differences by Sexual Preference of Administrator	37
F. Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests Among Mean Scores for Research Question Three: Effects for Differences by Worksetting of Administrator	41
G. Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests Among Mean Scores for Ad Hoc Outcomes	44

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Correlations for Test-Retest Reliability	27
2.	Average Correlation Mean Scores for Test-Retest Reliability By Categories Related to the Work Environment	28
3.	Factor Scores for Positive and Negative Discriminators for Factor 1: Supporting Gay Rights and Rejecting Discrimination in the Workplace	30
4.	Factor Scores for Positive and Negative Discriminators for Factor 2: Gay Persons Should Not Make An Issue of Their Gayness in Work Related Phenomena	31
5.	Factor Scores for Positive and Negative Discriminators for Factor 3: Withholding Support and Benefits for Gay People As Well as Rejecting the Notion That Gay People and Straight People Are Treated Similarly	32
6.	Factor Scores for Positive and Negative Discriminators for Factor 4: Gay Persons Are Discriminated Against and Are Fearful of Negative Treatment in the Workplace	33
7.	Mean Scores for the Main Effects by Sex	35
8.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sex by Preference on Factor 2	35
9.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Sex on Factor 2	36
10.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Sex on Factor 3	36
11.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sex by Preference on Factor 4	36
12.	Mean Scores for the Main Effects by Sexual Preference	38
13.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sex by Preference by Occupation on Factor 2	38
14.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Preference on Factor 2	39
15.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate by Preference on Factor 2	39
16.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Preference on Factor 3	39

List of Tables (Continued)

Table		Page
17.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Preference by Occupation on Factor 3	40
18.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate by Preference on Factor 3	40
18A.	Mean Scores for the Main Effects by Occupation	41A
19.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Occupation on Factor 1	42
20.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Occupation on Factor 2	42
21.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Occupation on Factor 3	43
22.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate by Occupation on Factor 4	43
23.	Mean Scores for the Main Effects by Sign	45
24.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate on Factor 1	45
25.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate on Factor 2	46
26.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate on Factor 3	46
27.	Duncan's Multiple Range Test Among Mean Scores for the Interaction of Sign by Replicate on Factor 4	47

The research about how administrators feel toward gay persons at work has been attributed to a few studies. Administrators represent a component of the workplace social and cultural systems who most probably have had varying beliefs regarding gay persons, and who may or may not have internalized a manifest homophobia regarding homosexuals dependent upon their belief systems. Symptoms of homophobic behavior may include denial, hatred, violent outbursts, and unprofessional behavior toward gay people. The result for the gay person,dependent upon where they may be in the disclosure process, may result in exacerbated intrapsychic conflict as well as job loss. The major purpose of this study were: 1) to isolate and to identify some typologies of belief that administrators may have toward gay people in the workplace, and 2) to see how the typologies of belief were impacted by sex, sexual preference, and worksetting.

Q-methodology was used to collect the data in order to determine typologies of belief about gay rights in the workplace. The sample of this study included: 96 administrators, 4 authorities, 5 experts, and 16 individuals for or against gay right issues. The background data included ten characteristics which were:

sex, sexual preference, age, marital status, level of education, religion, occupation, title of occupation, income level, and race. The Q-methodology included 48 belief item statements that related to 12 categories in the workplace on gay issues. These categories were: policy affecting gay employees; AIDS; discrimination; socialization; employee self-image; benefits for gay employees; salary increments, promotions, and transfers; personal and disclosure issues; office communication; interpersonal relations; administrator and subordinate relations; and delegation, responsibility, and trust (see Appendix A).

Each category had four belief item statements, two which were positive and two which were negative. An example of a positive statement which typified the category of benefits for gay employees was: "gay employees should be entitled to the same benefit package as straight employees, because benefits should be consistent with all groups of employees." An example of a negative statement which typified the category of discrimination was: "Companies and academic institutions are not likely to protect gay persons if left to their own efforts, because gay people are not discriminated against."

A pilot study was conducted to do content validity on the belief item statements, to do a test-retest reliability on the final belief item statements, and to determine the time necessary to complete the background

data sheet as well as the Q-sort. Initially, 71 statements were developed using three positive and three negative statements for each category of administrator belief. Each of the 71 items was then rated for agreement, clarity, and realism. Mean scores for each rating were determined and used to delete items as a measure of content validity. Correlations between a test and retest on the forty-eight item statements by a group of individuals were determined, as a measure of the stability and consistency of the study items for reliability. The test-retest correlations were also averaged across items by category. The average test-retest correlations by category while relatively small do support in part the stability of the item set given the small number of subjects in the study. The researcher had to work at great length to complete the retest. The appearance of relative stability in the item set even though the correlations are low, can be looked at as indicators. The two sets of ratings were a laborious task for individuals though the correlations are low (see Appendix B). The actual time to complete the Q-sort and data sheet ranged from thirty to forty-five minutes.

Person by person correlations and factor analysis were used to analyze the data to identify typologies of administrator beliefs about gay rights in the workplace. The factors were entitled: 1) Supporting gay rights and rejecting discrimination in the workplace; 2) Gay persons

should not make an issue of their gayness in work related phenomena; 3) Withholding support and benefits for gay people as well as rejecting the notion that gay people and straight people are treated similarly in the workplace; and 4) Gay persons are discriminated against and are fearful of negative treatment in the workplace. A rank order discriminant analysis was performed to identify the positive and negative item discriminators for each of the factors, and in depth personal interviews were conducted with four administrators on each of the factors. The selection of the administrators for interviews was based upon the positive and negative item discriminators that typified each factor (see Appendix C).

The study questioned the effects of sex, sexual preference, and worksetting based upon administrators' beliefs toward gay people. The three research questions were as follows: 1) To what extent will sex of administrator effect administrators' beliefs toward gay people in the work environment?, 2) To what extent will sexual preference of administrator effect administrators' beliefs towards gay persons in the work environment?, and 3) To what extent will worksetting (academic versus business and industry) of administrator effect administrators' beliefs toward gay persons in the work environment?

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was done on the data with the four positive and four negative

discriminators of each factor to test for interaction effects by sex, sexual preference, and worksetting of administrator. Where F tests were significant, Duncan's Multiple Range Tests were made for significant interactions of three or more mean scores at the $p < .05$ level.

The results for the tests of hypotheses showed significant differences. The first research question tested the effect for differences by sex of administrator. The Results showed: no significant differences for the main effects by sex (see Appendix C, Table 7). Significant interactions occurred on Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 3.96$, $p < .05$ and Factor 4, $F(1,88) = 7.91$, $p < .05$; and for sex by sign[1] on Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 7.95$, $p < .05$ and Factor 3, $F(1,88) = 4.60$, $p < .05$.

The Duncan's Multiple Range Tests (hereafter referred to as DMRT) among means for the interaction of sex by preference on Factor 2, which was entitled, "Gay persons should not make an issue of their gayness in work related phenomena" showed lesbians, gay males, and straight males being in more agreement with the factor; with mean scores of 4.93, 4.89, and 4.76 as opposed to straight females who were in less agreement and rejected the factor with a mean score of 4.21. The DMRT for the interaction of sign by

---

1. Sign refers to positive and/or negative item discriminators.

sex on Factor 2 showed that female respondents were in more agreement with the negative items on the factor; with a mean score of 6.06, then they were with the positive items; with a mean score of 3.39 (see Appendix D, Tables 8 and 9).

The DMRT among means for the interaction of sign by sex on Factor 3, which was entitled, "Withholding support and benefits for gay people as well as rejecting the notion that gay people and straight people are treated similarly in the workplace" showed that the male respondents were more extreme in their beliefs on the positive and negative item discriminators; with mean scores of 6.64 and 4.19. Both males and females accepted the positive item discriminators and rejected the negative item discriminators (see Appendix D, Table 10).

The DMRT among means for the interaction of sex by preference on Factor 4, which was entitled, "Gay persons are discriminated against and are fearful of negative treatment in the workplace" showed straight males with a mean score of 4.19 to be in more agreement with the factor as opposed to females who were in less agreement; with a mean score of 3.88. Lesbians were in more agreement with the factor with a mean score of 4.12 as opposed to gay males who agreed less with a mean score of 4.01 (see Appendix D, Table 11).

The second research question tested the effect of differences by sexual preference of administrator. The

results showed: A mean effects significant difference for sexual preference of Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 16.80$, $p < .01$ and Factor 3, $F(1,88) = 3.63$, $p < .05$. Significant interactions were noted for sex by preference by occupation on Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 4.95$, $p < .01$; sign by preference on Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 14.19$, $p < .01$ and Factor 3, $F(1,88) = 5.06$, $p < .01$; and sign by replicate[2] by preference on Factor 2, $F(6,528) = 2.35$, $p < .05$ and Factor 3, $F(6,528) = 2.32$, $p < .05$.

The DMRT among means were found on Factor 2 and Factor 3. The gay respondents were in somewhat more agreement with Factor 2; with a mean score of 4.91. The straight respondents, with a lower mean score of 4.64 were in less agreement with Factor 3 (see Appendix E, Table 12).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sex by preference by occupation on Factor 2 showed gay male academic administrators, with a high mean score of 5.02 and lesbian business administrators, with a high mean score of 4.97, were in more agreement with the factor that gay people should not make an issue of their gayness in the workplace. Straight female academic administrators, with a lower mean score of 4.66 rejected the factor and were in more agreement of gay people disclosing in the workplace (see Appendix E, Table 13).

The DMRT for interaction of sign by preference on

---

2. Replicate refers to item discriminator.

Factor 2 showed that straights and gays accepted the negative item discriminators, with mean scores of 5.59 and 6.30; as opposed to the gays who were more extreme in their rejection of the positive item discriminators, with a lower mean score of 3.53; as well as the straights, with a lower mean score of 3.69 (see Appendix E, Table 14).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sign by replicate by preference on Factor 2 indicated that the gays were in very strong agreement with the positive replicate one item, with a mean score of 13.86 and stated that companies and colleges would probably not protect gays because gay people were not discriminated against. Gays were also in strong agreement with the negative replicate three item, with a mean score of 7.46 and suggested that state laws be enacted to protect gay people from discrimination because people as a rule would not do it on their own (See Appendix E, Table 15).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interactions of sign by preference on Factor 3 showed that straight and gay respondents, with mean scores of 6.94 and 6.58, were more extreme in their acceptance of the negative item discriminators as opposed to the positive item discriminators which they rejected with mean scores of 4.05 and 4.14 (see Appendix E, Table 16).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interactions of sign by preference by occupation on Factor 3 indicated that gay and straight administrators from business, with

higher mean scores of 6.80 and 7.00 were more extreme in their acceptance of the negative item discriminators; and in their rejection of the positive item discriminators with lower mean scores of 4.01 and 4.03. Gay and straight academic administrators, with higher mean scores of 6.35 and 6.88 believed and accepted the negative item on this factor (see Appendix E, Table 17).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interactions of sign by replicate by preference on Factor 3 showed that the straight respondents, with a mean score of 7.79, agreed strongly with the negative replicate one item. The gay and straight respondents were also in strong agreement with the negative replicate four item, with mean scores of 7.27 and 7.50. On the other hand, both straights and gays rejected the positive replicate two item, with lower mean scores of 2.92 and 3.29. The gay respondents also rejected the positive replicate four item, with a lower mean score of 3.83. The Mean scores for the straights agreed strongly with the negative replicate one and four items and rejected the positive replicate two item (see Appendix E, Table 18).

The third research question tested for the effects for differences by worksetting of administrator. The results showed: no significant differences for the main effects by occupation (see Appendix F, Table 18A). Significant interactions were noted for sign by occupation on Factor 1, $F(1,88) = 5.61$, $p < .01$; Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 7.20$,

$p < .01$; and Factor 3, $F(1,88) = 4.83$, $p < .01$ and sign by replicate by occupation on Factor 4, $F(6,528) = 5.34$, $p < .01$.

The DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sign by occupation on Factor 1 showed that business administrators were clear on their rejection of the negative item discriminators with a lower mean score of 2.60 as opposed to the academic administrators, with a higher mean score of 6.69, who accepted the positive item discriminators. The academic administrators, with a mean score of 4.52, were neutral on their agreement with the negative item discriminators (see Appendix F, Table 19).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sign by occupation on Factor 2 indicated that academic administrators, with mean scores of 6.13 and 3.51, were more extreme on the negative item discriminators and rejection of the positive item discriminators; as opposed to the business administrators who were less extreme, with mean scores of 5.74 and 3.71 for the positive items (see Appendix F, Table 20).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sign by occupation on Factor 3 showed that the business administrators were more extreme in their agreement with the negative item discriminators, with a higher mean score of 6.90 and rejected the positive items with a lower mean score of 4.02. The academic administrators were in agreement with the negative item discriminators, with a

higher mean score of 6.61 and rejected the positive items, with a lower mean score of 4.17 (see Appendix F, Table 21).

The DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sign by replicate by occupation on Factor 4 showed that academic and business administrators were in strong agreement with the negative replicate two item discriminator, with higher mean scores of 6.19 and 7.07. The business administrators were also in agreement with the positive replicate two item discriminator, with a higher mean score of 5.48. The academic administrators, however, were in stronger agreement, with a mean score of 6.10. The academic and business administrators rejected the positive three item with lower mean scores of 1.55 and 1.94. The academic administrators rejected the positive four item with a low mean score of 2.12, as well as the positive one item, with a low mean score of 2.69 (see Appendix F, Table 22).

The results for the ad hoc outcomes were as follows: A significant difference for the main effects for sign was noted on Factor 1, $F(1,88) = 1328.20$, $p < .01$; Factor 2, $F(1,88) = 411.11$, $p < .01$; Factor 3, $F(1,88) = 714.60$, $p < .01$; and Factor 4, $F(1,88) = 252.13$, $p < .01$. Significant interactions for sign by replicate were found on Factor 1, $F(6,528) = 67.89$, $p < .05$; Factor 2, $F(6,528) = 25.15$, $p < .05$; Factor 3, $F(6,528) = 79.46$, $p < .01$; and Factor 4, $F(6,528) = 233.01$, $p < .01$. The

DMRT for the ad hoc outcomes are shown on Tables 23, 24, 25, and 26 in Appendix G. Overall, the results for the mean scores for the main effects by sign showed the positive item discriminators being rated higher on Factor 1, with a mean score of 6.56; and being rated lower on Factors 2, 3, and 4, with mean scores of 3.61, 4.09, and 3.09. The negative item discriminators for sign on Factor 1 were rated lowest, with a mean score of 2.47; and higher on Factors 2, 3, and 4, with mean scores of 5.95, 6.76, and 5.01.

The results of the DMRT for the interaction of sign by replicate on Factor 1 indicated that the study respondents were in more agreement with the positive items on the factor as opposed to the negative items, which had lower mean scores as shown on Table 24 in Appendix G.

For the interaction of sign by replicate on Factor 2, as shown on Table 25 in Appendix G; the results showed that the study respondents were in strongest agreement with the negative item three and least agreed with the positive replicate two item. The mean scores also showed that the respondents rejected the four positive discriminators on this factor. Lastly, the study respondents were in more agreement with the negative items two and three on the factor; and rejected, and were in less agreement with the positive items.

Table 26 in Appendix G shows the DMRT among mean scores for the interaction of sign by replicate on

Factor 3. The mean scores of the respondents were in stronger agreement with negative items one and four, and rejected and disagreed the most with positive items two and four. On the whole, the mean scores of the study respondents were in most agreement with the negative items as opposed to the positive items on the factor.

The results of the DMRT for the interaction of sign by replicate on Factor 4 showed that study respondents were in most agreement with the negative two item and in fairly strong agreement with the positive two item. The mean scores of the study respondents were in most agreement with the negative two and positive two items as opposed to the positive one, three and four items.

There were four general findings of this study which were: 1) some gay people were not as open as one might expect toward disclosure regarding their beliefs toward gay people in the workplace; 2) females who were both straight and lesbian were more open to disclosure on gay rights issues in the workplace; 3) some anti-gay sentiment among some administrators' beliefs was found in both gay and straight administrators; and 4) business and academic administrators who participated had positive attitudes toward gay people despite the fact that some administrators remained homophobic.

Several practical implications for the whole workplace resulted from this study. First, gay people may find themselves more readily accepted as administrators in the

workplace. Second, designing communications targeted at overcoming anti-gay bias in the workplace should be oriented toward women who are both straight and lesbian as well as gay men. Third, some administrators who had extreme positions of anti-gay sentiment need to be prohibited from verbalizing their prejudices in the workplace. Fourth, business and academic administrators; due to greater positive attitudes toward gay people; should be included in the advancement of gay employees in the workplace.

Three theoretical implications may be drawn from the study. These implications were drawn from theories about social interaction, symbolic interaction, and prejudice and discrimination. One finding of the study that may be drawn from theories of social interaction was that administrators who participated had positive attitudes toward gay people despite the fact that some administrators remained homophobic. It is possible that changes in attitudes toward gay people in our society may be linked to social interactions, and that many people have most likely developed an expanded consciousness about gay people and have changed their attitudes as a result.

A second theoretical implication may be linked to theories of symbolic interaction. It is possible to link the development of the gay and lesbian community in America to processes of how people interpreted the actions of others and how those actions were responded to by

others. Gay people may have developed a sense of "gay identity" through their social interactions which may have given meaning to how they defined who they were as people. For example, one problem for gay and lesbian people has most likely been that many people in America from early age into adulthood have perhaps internalized attitudes, beliefs, and social behaviors that were heterosexual in nature.

Another theoretical implication of the study may be drawn from theories of prejudice and discrimination which may have its roots in beliefs or stereotypes that one may have about what gay people do or how gay people act. It is possible that competitiveness among different types of groups for economic resources as well as acceptance may have produced negative reactions toward gay and lesbian people over time. For example, the visibility and the growing awareness of the gay and lesbian community over the past twenty years may have produced negative reactions in some people due to competitiveness for jobs, benefits, and economic as well as social sanctions that gay people be on par with straight people. Another possible explanation for prejudice may be explained by the way people in society categorize people in their social words as "us" versus "them", where the us group is socially accepted and the them group is undesirable. For instance, some people in our society may have labeled gays as the outgroup due to perhaps negative social, religious, and

governmental sanctions toward homosexuality. Another source of prejudice may be early learning experiences. For example, some people may be biased toward gay people as they were perhaps socialized by their families, religion, school system, peer group, or through the mass media.

Appendix A

Master List Q-Sort Item Statements

NEG	1.	Companies and academic institutions are not likely to protect gay persons if left to heir own efforts, because gay people are not discriminated against.	DISCRIMINATION
POS	2.	Tasks performed by gay employees should be just as achievable as tasks performed by straight employees, because task accomplishment depends upon a person's competency level in a specific area rather then his/her sexual preference.	ADMINISTRATOR/ SUBORDINATE RELATIONS
POS	3.	Both gay and straight employees should be judged as similar in appearance because they have received the same family rearing experiences.	PERSONAL AND DISCLOSURE ISSUES
NEG	4.	In selecting an employee to represent an administrator at a meeting, gay employees should be avoided because gays are likely to act inappropriately.	OFFICE COMMUNICATIONS
POS	5.	Absenteeism is less likely to occur among gay employees if gay support groups are available at work, because such support groups may reduce the level of isolation felt by gay employees.	POLICY
POS	6.	Gay employees are more likely to be more comfortable with administrators who are sensitive to gay issues, because administrators who are sensitive and empathic allow gay people to be themselves.	SELF-IMAGE

POS	7.	Performance evaluations by administrators should be just as equitable for gay employees as for all other employees, because performance evaluations should judge an employee's competency rather then an employee's sexual preference.	ADMINISTRATOR/ SUBORDINATE RELATIONS
NEG	8.	Straight employees are less likely to have small talk with gay employees in the hallways because of the fear of being thought of by others as being gay.	INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
POS	9.	Discrimination against gay men is more likely to occur with mandatory AIDS testing because gay men are in a high risk group of people who contract AIDS.	AIDS
POS	10.	Gay employees should expect to be included in work related communication at their position level, because exclusion would likely impair their performance.	OFFICE COMMUNICATIONS
NEG	11.	Gay employees should avoid attending support groups at work because support groups are likely to identify them as gay.	SOCIALIZATION
NEG	12.	Administrators should avoid hiring gay persons as employees because gay persons may spread AIDS in the workplace.	AIDS

POS	13.	Gay employees as opposed to straight employees should have the same medical benefits because gay persons and straight persons have similar medical needs.	BENEFITS
POS	14.	Administrators should implement training programs on gay issues, because employees need to develop an understanding of bias against gay persons that may be prevalent in the work world.	POLICY
NEG	15.	All else being equal, a qualified gay person is less likely to be hired for positions, because gay employees are viewed as being less effective then straight employees.	POLICY
POS	16.	Gay persons should be able to bring their gay companions to work related events, because these events are intended for all employees, friends and family.	SOCIALIZATION
POS	17.	A gay employee should feel free to come out of the closet at work because others should like a person for who he or she is regardless of their sexuality.	PERSONAL AND DISCLOSURE ISSUES
POS	18.	An administrator is more likely to scold a gay as opposed to a straight employee for discussing their sexual preference with other employees because such discussions are inappropriate at work.	INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

POS	19.	A gay employee or a straight employee can represent an administrator at meetings they are unable to attend, because gay employees and straight employees are likely to be equally effective.	OFFICE COMMUNICATIONS
NEG	20.	Gay employees as opposed to straight employees should expect to be judged differently, because they are likely to act, dress, and behave in a different manner.	PERSONAL AND DISCLOSURE ISSUES
NEG	21.	A gay employee should expect to perform less work then a straight employee, because gay persons are unable to fully concentrate on their job.	ADMINISTRATOR/ SUBORDINATE RELATIONS
POS	22.	Policy statements should be made barring discrimination, because gay employees will be less productive without such protection.	DISCRIMINATION
NEG	23.	Medical and life insurance benefits for gay employees, should differ from straight employees, because gay persons are more likely to use more benefits should they contract AIDS.	BENEFITS
NEG	24.	Educational programs on AIDS for heterosexuals in the workplace are less likely to be effective because AIDS is the problem of the gay community.	AIDS

POS	25.	Gay employees as well as straight employees are likely to perform tasks in a similar manner because one's sexual preference has little to do with one's job performance.	DELEGATION/ RESPONSIBILITY/ TRUST
NEG	26.	Gay employees should avoid identifying themselves in the workplace, because they will be rejected by other employees once they are aware of their homosexuality.	SELF-IMAGE
NEG	27.	Gay employees should be excluded from some communication activities because people in power are likely to be biased against homosexuals.	OFFICE COMMUNICATIONS
POS	28.	Gay employees are more likely to chum with other gay employees, because they will offer more support and understanding then straight employees.	INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
POS	29.	State laws should be enacted to protect gay persons from job discrimination because individuals as a rule will not do it on their own.	DISCRIMINATION
NEG	30.	Administrators are more likely to be discriminating toward openly gay employees as opposed to straight employees in the work world because gay persons are more likely to be strange and different.	DISCRIMINATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

POS	31.	Gay employees should be entitled to the same benefit package as straight employees, because benefits should be consistent with all groups of employees.	BENEFITS
POS	32.	An administrator should be willing to delegate responsibilities to both gays and straights because sexual preference has little to do with one's ability in carrying out a task.	DELEGATION/ RESPONSIBILITY/ TRUST
NEG	33.	Gay employees should expect to be excluded from delegation of responsibilities, because gay employees are less likely to be trustworthy in accomplishing such tasks.	DELEGATION/ RESPONSIBILITY/ TRUST
POS	34.	Gay employees and straight employees should receive similar salaries for similar jobs, because work performance criteria should exclude considerations of sexual preference.	SALARY/PROMOTION/ TRANSFER
NEG	35.	Gay employees should be limited in responsibilities given, because conflicts as a result of their homosexuality are likely to interfere with their job task performance.	DELEGATION/ RESPONSIBILITY/ TRUST
NEG	36.	A gay employee's self-esteem is less likely to be as stable as the self-esteem of straight persons at work, because gay persons are likely to have unresolved problems with their homosexuality.	SELF-IMAGE

NEG	37.	Gay employees should seldom expect to be promoted because administrators are unlikely to want them to be visible in the organization.	SALARY/PROMOTION/ TRANSFER
POS	38.	Administrators should promote AIDS educational programs at work for their employees and this includes instructional use of condoms on how to prevent the spread of AIDS.	AIDS
NEG	39.	Higher absenteeism is more likely to occur among gay employees, because gay persons are more stressed living a "double life" in the work world.	POLICY
NEG	40.	Gay as opposed to straight employees are likely to take many breaks, because they have problems concentrating on their work for long periods of time.	INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
POS	41.	Administrators should be nonjudgmental in promoting gay employees, because promotions for employees should be based on experience, competency and level of skills.	SALARY/PROMOTION/ TRANSFER
NEG	42.	Gay employees should refrain from bringing their partners to work related events because they will offend straight employees.	SOCIALIZATION

POS	43.	Gay employees are more likely to need support groups at work because gay persons as opposed to straight persons are more likely to encounter social conflict situations.	SOCIALIZATION
NEG	44.	Gay employees as opposed to straight employees should be easy to identify because gays have special ways of talking and gesturing.	PERSONAL AND DISCLOSURE ISSUES
POS	45.	Gay persons should feel comfortable with their sexual identity because being comfortable with their gayness will help them communicate a positive self-image to others.	SELF-IMAGE
NEG	46.	Gay employees as opposed to straight employees are less likely to take advantage of tuition benefits because gay persons are less able to focus on appropriate study habits.	BENEFITS
NEG	47.	An administrator should be able to fire a gay employee, because he or she may contract AIDS and is likely to spread it to other employees.	ADMINISTRATOR/ SUBORDINATE RELATIONS
NEG	48.	A gay employee should expect to receive less salary then a straight employee doing the same job because a gay employee is less capable of performing academic or corporate jobs.	SALARY/PROMOTION/ TRANSFER

Appendix B

Correlations for Test-Retest Reliability

TABLE 1

CORRELATIONS FOR TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY

ITEM #	CORRELATION	ITEM #	CORRELATION
1.	.10	25.	.67
2.	.56	26.	.35
3.	.85	27.	-.03
4.	.48	28.	.12
5.	.25	29.	.81
6.	.30	30.	.65
7.	-.12	31.	.36
8.	.28	32.	.49
9.	.25	33.	.47
10.	.62	34.	.21
11.	.51	35.	-.47
12.	.28	36.	.64
13.	.87	37.	.37
14.	.50	38.	.82
15.	-.21	39.	.28
16.	.35	40.	.16
17.	.60	41.	.32
18.	.74	42.	.33
19.	.53	43.	.13
20.	.34	44.	.67
21.	.34	45.	.59
22.	.33	46.	.27
23.	.71	47.	.38
24.	.65	48.	.11

TABLE 1 2

AVERAGED CORRELATION MEAN SCORES FOR TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY BY CATEGORIES RELATED TO THE WORK ENVIRONMENT

CATEGORY	CORRELATION
POLICY AFFECTING GAY EMPLOYEES	.21
AIDS	.50
DISCRIMINATION	.47
SOCIALIZATION	.33
EMPLOYEE SELF-IMAGE	.47
BENEFITS	.56
SALARY INCREMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.25
PERSONAL AND DISCLOSURE ISSUES	.61
OFFICE COMMUNICATIONS	.40
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS	.32
ADMINISTRATOR AND SUBORDINATE RELATIONS	.29
DELEGATION, RESPONSIBILITY AND TRUST	.29

Appendix C

Tables for Factor Scores of Positive and Negative Discriminators for Factors One, Two, Three, and Four

TABLE 3

FACTOR SCORES FOR POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS FOR FACTOR 1: SUPPORTING GAY RIGHTS AND REJECTING DISCRIMINATION IN THE WORKPLACE

ITEM #	POSITIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
17	A gay employee should feel free to come out of the closet at work because others should like a person for who he or she is regardless of their sexuality.	Disclosure (POSITIVE)	0.55	-0.79	-2.39	-2.30
31	Gay employees should be entitled to the same benefit package as straight employees, because benefits should be consistent with all groups of employees.	Benefits (POSITIVE)	1.46	-0.54	-0.85	0.32
16	Gay persons should be able to bring their gay companions to work related events, because these events are intended for all employees, friends, and family.	Socialization (POSITIVE)	0.80	-1.61	-0.75	-0.89
45	Gay persons should feel comfortable with their sexual identity because being comfortable with their gayness will help them communicate a positive self-image to others.	Self-Image (POSITIVE)	0.82	-0.94	-1.28	0.00
ITEM #	NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
12	Administrators should avoid hiring gay persons as employees because gay persons may spread AIDS in the workplace.	AIDS (NEGATIVE)	-1.74	0.36	-0.13	1.05
47	An administrator should be able to fire a gay employee, because he or she may contract AIDS and is likely to spread it to other employees.	Supervisor/Subordinate Relations (NEGATIVE)	-1.90	-0.09	-0.35	1.58
42	Gay employees should refrain from bringing their partners to work related events because it will offend straight employees.	Socialization (NEGATIVE)	-0.58	2.06	0.94	0.22
48	A gay employee should expect to receive less salary then a straight employee doing the same job because a gay employee is less capable of performing academic or corporate jobs.	Salary/Promotion/Transfer (NEGATIVE)	-1.69	-0.47	-0.80	1.22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

FACTOR SCORES FOR POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS FOR FACTOR 2: GAY PERSONS SHOULD NOT MAKE AN ISSUE OF THEIR GAYNESS IN WORK RELATED PHENOMENA

ITEM #	POSITIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
1	Companies and academic institutions are not likely to protect gay persons if left to their own efforts, because gay people are not discriminated against.	Discrimination (NEGATIVE)	-0.61	1.14	-1.73	-2.43
42	Gay employees should refrain from bringing their partners to work related events because they will offend straight employees.	Socialization (NEGATIVE)	-0.58	2.06	0.94	0.22
24	Educational programs on AIDS for heterosexuals in the workplace are less likely to be effective because AIDS is the problem of the gay community.	AIDS (NEGATIVE)	-0.83	0.40	-0.31	-2.16
4	In selecting an employee to represent an administrator at a meeting, gay employees should be avoided because gays are likely to act inappropriately.	Office Communications (NEGATIVE)	-1.17	0.40	-0.92	-0.16
ITEM #	NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR STANDARD SCORES 1	2	3	4
29	State laws should be enacted to protect gay persons from job discrimination because individuals as a rule will not do it on their own.	Discrimination (POSITIVE)	1.14	-3.35	1.64	0.16
14	Administrators should implement training progracs on gay issues, because employees need to develop an understanding of bias against gay persons that may be prevalent in the work world.	Policy (POSITIVE)	0.63	-1.91	-0.53	-0.34
15	All else being equal, a qualified gay person is less likely to be hired for positions, because gay employees are viewed as being less effective then straight employees.	Policy (NEGATIVE)	0.19	-0.95	2.05	0.66
38	Administrators should promote AIDS educational programs at work for their employees and this includes instructional use of condoms on how to prevent the spread of AIDS.	AIDS (POSITIVE)	0.50	-1.67	-1.20	1.97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5

FACTOR SCORES FOR POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS FOR FACTOR 3: WITHHOLDING SUPPORT AND BENEFITS FOR GAY PEOPLE AS WELL AS REJECTING THE NOTION THAT GAY PEOPLE AND STRAIGHT PEOPLE ARE TREATED SIMILARLY IN THE WORKPLACE

ITEM #	POSITIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
23	Medical and life insurance benefits for gay employees, should differ from straight employees, because gay persons are more likely to use more benefits should they contract AIDS.	Benefits (NEGATIVE)	-1.04	0.47	1.60	-0.56
15	All else being equal, a qualified gay person is less likely to be hired for positions, because gay employees are viewed as being less effective then straight employees.	Policy (NEGATIVE)	0.19	-0.95	2.05	0.66
37	Gay employees should seldom expect to be promoted because administrators are unlikely to want them to be visible in the organization.	Salary/Promotion/Transfer (NEGATIVE)	-0.43	-1.03	1.52	0.21
39	Higher absenteeism is more likely to occur among gay employees, because gay persons are more stressed living a "double life" in the work world.	Policy (NEGATIVE)	-0.58	0.07	1.47	0.17
ITEM #	NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
13	Gay employees as opposed to straight employees should have the same medical benefits because gay persons and straight persons have similar medical needs.	Benefits (POSITIVE)	0.84	0.43	-2.08	1.45
25	Gay employees as well as straight employees are likely to perform tasks in a similar manner because one's sexual preference has little to do with one's job performance.	Delegation/Responsibility/Trust (POSITIVE)	1.33	1.20	-0.68	0.51
2	Tasks performed by gay employees should be just as achievable as tasks performed by straight employees, because task accomplishment depends upon a person's competency level in a specific area rather then his/her sexual preference.	Supervisor/Subordinate Relations (POSITIVE)	1.36	1.53	0.14	1.32
3	Both gay and straight employees should be judged as similar in appearance because they have received the same family rearing experiences.	Disclosure (POSITIVE)	0.22	0.87	-0.52	0.67

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6

FACTOR SCORES FOR POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS FOR FACTOR 4: GAY PERSONS ARE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST AND ARE FEARFUL OF NEGATIVE TREATMENT IN THE WORKPLACE

ITEM #	POSITIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
48	A gay employee should expect to receive less salary than a straight employee doing the same job because a gay employee is less capable of performing academic or corporate jobs.	Salary/Promotion/Transfer (NEGATIVE)	-1.69	-0.47	-0.80	1.22
47	An administrator should be able to fire a gay employee, because he or she may contract AIDS and is likely to spread it to other employees.	Supervisor/Subordinate Relations (NEGATIVE)	-1.90	-0.09	-0.35	1.58
38	Administrators should promote AIDS educational programs at work for their employees and this includes instructional use of condoms on how to prevent the spread of AIDS.	AIDS (POSITIVE)	0.50	-1.67	-1.20	1.97
21	A gay employee should expect to perform less work than a straight employee, because gay persons are unable to fully concentrate on their job.	Supervisor/Subordinate Relations (NEGATIVE)	-1.31	-0.73	-0.71	0.56

ITEM #	NEGATIVE DISCRIMINATORS	CATEGORY OF CONCERN	FACTOR SCORES 1	2	3	4
28	Gay employees are more likely to chum with other gay employees, because they will offer more support and understanding than straight employees.	Interpersonal Relations (POSITIVE)	0.44	0.34	1.05	-1.66
6	Gay employees are more likely to be more comfortable with administrators who are sensitive to gay issues, because administrators who are sensitive and empathic allow gay people to be themselves.	Self-Image (POSITIVE)	0.90	-0.31	1.31	-1.91
24	Educational programs on AIDS for heterosexuals in the workplace are less likely to be effective because AIDS is the problem of the gay community.	AIDS (NEGATIVE)	-0.83	0.40	-0.31	-2.16
1	Companies and academic institutions are not likely to protect gay persons if left to their own efforts, because gay people are not discriminated against.	Discrimination (NEGATIVE)	-0.61	1.14	-1.73	-2.43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests
Among Mean Scores for Research Question One:
Effects for Differences by Sex of Administrator

TABLE 9

MEAN SCORES* FOR THE MAIN EFFECTS BY SEX

VARIABLE NAME	MALE	FEMALE
FACTOR 1 "Supporting gay rights and rejecting discrimination in the workplace"	4.49	4.54
FACTOR 2 "Gay persons should not make an issue of their gayness in work related phenomena"	4.83	4.73
FACTOR 3 "Withholding support and benefits for gay people as well as rejecting the notion that gay people and straight people are treated similarly in the workplace"	5.44	5.42
FACTOR 4 "Gay persons are discriminated against and are fearful of negative treatment in the workplace"	4.10	4.00

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Total sample N = 96

TABLE 8

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES

FOR THE INTERACTION OF SEX BY PREFERENCE ON FACTOR 2

SEX	FEMALE	MALE	MALE	FEMALE
PREFERENCE	STRAIGHT	STRAIGHT	GAY	LESBIAN
MEAN SCORE	4.21	4.76	4.89	4.93

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

TABLE 9

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY SEX ON FACTOR 2

SIGN	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
SEX	FEMALE	MALE	MALE	FEMALE
MEAN SCORE	3.39	3.82	5.84	6.06

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the $p < .05$ level.

TABLE 10

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY SEX ON FACTOR 3

SIGN	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
SEX	MALE	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE
MEAN SCORE	4.00	4.19	6.64	6.87

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the $p < .05$ level.

TABLE 11

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SEX BY PREFERENCE ON FACTOR 4

SEX	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE
PREFERENCE	STRAIGHT	GAY	LESBIAN	STRAIGHT
MEAN SCORE	3.88	4.01	4.12	4.19

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the $p < .05$ level.

Appendix E

Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests Among Mean Scores for Research Question Two: Effects for Differences by Sexual Preference of Administrator

TABLE 12

MEAN SCORES* FOR THE MAIN EFFECTS BY SEXUAL PREFERENCE

VARIABLE NAME	GAY	STRAIGHT
FACTOR 1 "Supporting gay rights and rejecting discrimination in the workplace"	4.55	4.48
FACTOR 2 "Gay persons should not make an issue of their gayness in work related phenomena"	4.91	4.64
FACTOR 3 "Withholding support and benefits for gay people as well as rejecting the notion that gay people and straight people are treated similarly in the workplace"	5.36	5.49
FACTOR 4 "Gay persons are discriminated against and are fearful of negative treatment in the workplace"	4.07	4.04

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Total sample N = 96

TABLE 13

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SEX BY PREFERENCE BY OCCUPATION ON FACTOR 2

SEX	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE
PREFERENCE	ST	ST	ST	ST	GY	LES	LES	GY
OCCUPATION	BSAD	ACAD	ACAD	BSAD	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD
MEAN SCORE	4.40	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.77	4.89	4.97	5.02

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

ACAD = Academic Administrator
BSAD = Business Administrator
GY = Gay
ST = Straight
LES = Lesbian

TABLE 14

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY PREFERENCE ON FACTOR 2

SIGN	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
PREFERENCE	GAY	STRAIGHT	STRAIGHT	GAY
MEAN SCORE	3.53	3.69	5.59	6.30

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

TABLE 15

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE BY PREFERENCE ON FACTOR 2

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	POS
REPLICATE	R2	R2	R3	R3	R4	R4	R1	R2	R2	R4	R1	R4	R3	R1	R3	R1
PREFERENCE	GY	ST	GY	ST	GY	GY	ST	ST	GY	ST	ST	GY	ST	GY	GY	GY
MEAN SCORE	2.86	2.96	3.48	3.57	3.92	4.09	4.15	5.02	5.46	5.65	5.65	5.94	6.06	6.35	7.46	13.86

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

SIGN: POS = POSITIVE; NEG = NEGATIVE; ST = STRAIGHT; GY = GAY

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One; R2 = Replicate Two; R3 = Replicate Three; R4 = Replicate Four

TABLE 16

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY PREFERENCE ON FACTOR 3

SIGN	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
PREFERENCE	STRAIGHT	GAY	GAY	STRAIGHT
MEAN SCORE	4.05	4.14	6.58	6.94

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

TABLE 17

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY PREFERENCE BY OCCUPATION ON FACTOR 3

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG
PREFERENCE	GY	ST	ST	GY	GY	GY	ST	ST
OCCUPATION	BSAD	BSAD	ACAD	ACAD	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD
MEAN SCORE	4.01	4.03	4.07	4.27	6.35	6.80	6.88	7.00

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

SIGN: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE

ST = STRAIGHT
GY = GAY

ACAD = Academic Administrator
BSAD = Business Administrator

TABLE 18

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE BY PREFERENCE ON FACTOR 3

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	NEG	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG
REPLICATE	R2	R2	R4	R3	R4	R3	R1	R2	R1	R2	R3	R3	R1	R4	R4	R1
PREFERENCE	ST	ST	GY	ST	ST	GY	ST	GY	GY	ST	GY	ST	GY	GY	ST	ST
MEAN SCORE	2.92	3.29	3.83	3.89	3.99	4.35	5.02	5.42	5.46	5.65	6.49	6.81	7.27	7.27	7.50	7.99

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Significant: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE

ST = STRAIGHT
GY = GAY

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One
R2 = Replicate Two
R3 = Replicate Three
R4 = Replicate Four

Appendix F

Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests
Among Mean Scores for Research Question Three:
Effects for Differences by Worksetting
of Administrator

TABLE 18A

MEAN SCORES* FOR THE MAIN EFFECTS BY OCCUPATION

VARIABLE NAME	ACADEMIC	BUSINESS
FACTOR 1 "Supporting gay rights and rejecting discrimination in the workplace"	4.51	4.52
FACTOR 2 "Gay persons should not make an issue of their gayness in work related phenomena"	4.83	4.72
FACTOR 3 "Withholding support and benefits for gay people as well as rejecting the notion that gay people and straight people are treated similarly in the workplace"	5.39	5.46
FACTOR 4 "Gay persons are discriminated against and are fearful of negative treatment in the workplace"	4.07	4.03

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the $p < .05$ level.

Total sample N = 96

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 19

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY OCCUPATION ON FACTOR 1

SIGN	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
OCCUPATION	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD
MEAN SCORE	2.60	4.52	6.43	6.69

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

ACAD = Academic Administrator
BSAD = Business Administrator

TABLE 20

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY OCCUPATION ON FACTOR 2

SIGN	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
OCCUPATION	ACAD	BSAD	BSAD	ACAD
MEAN SCORE	3.51	3.71	5.74	6.13

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

ACAD = Academic Administrator
BSAD = Business Administrator

TABLE 21

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY OCCUPATION ON FACTOR 3

SIGN	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
OCCUPATION	BSAD	ACAD	ACAD	BSAD
MEAN SCORE	4.02	4.17	6.61	6.90

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

ACAD = Academic Administrator
BSAD = Business Administrator

TABLE 22

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE BY OCCUPATION ON FACTOR 4

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	POS	NEG	NEG	POS	NEG	NEG
REPLICATE	R3	R3	R4	R4	R1	R1	R3	R3	R1	R1	R2	R4	R4	R2	R2	R2
OCCUPATION	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD	BSAD	ACAD	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD	BSAD	ACAD
MEAN SCORE	1.55	1.94	2.12	2.23	2.85	2.89	3.44	3.81	3.79	4.21	5.48	5.82	5.96	6.10	6.19	7.07

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Significant: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE
ST = STRAIGHT
GY = GAY

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One
R2 = Replicate Two
R3 = Replicate Three
R4 = Replicate Four

Appendix G

Tables for Duncan's Multiple Range Tests Among Mean Scores for Ad Hoc Outcomes

TABLE 23

MEAN SCORES* FOR THE MAIN EFFECTS BY SIGN

VARIABLE NAME	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
FACTOR 1 "Supporting gay rights and rejecting discrimination in the workplace"	6.56	2.47
FACTOR 2 "Gay persons should not make an issue of their gayness in work related phenomena"	3.61	5.95
FACTOR 3 "Withholding support and benefits for gay people as well as rejecting the notion that gay people and straight people are treated similarly in the workplace"	4.09	6.76
FACTOR 4 "Gay persons are discriminated against and are fearful of negative treatment in the workplace"	3.09	5.01

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Total sample N = 96

TABLE 24

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE ON FACTOR 1

SIGN	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	POS	POS	POS	POS
REPLICATE	R3	R1	R4	R2	R2	R4	R1	R3
MEAN SCORE	1.74	1.96	2.18	4.00	5.87	6.41	6.44	7.52

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Significant: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One
R2 = Replicate Two
R3 = Replicate Three
R4 = Replicate Four

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 25

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE ON FACTOR 2

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG
REPLICATE	R2	R3	R1	R4	R2	R4	R1	R3
MEAN SCORE	2.91	3.52	4.00	4.00	5.24	5.79	5.99	6.76

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Significant: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One
R2 = Replicate Two
R3 = Replicate Three
R4 = Replicate Four

TABLE 26

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE* TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE ON FACTOR 3

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG
REPLICATE	R2	R4	R3	R1	R2	R3	R4	R1
MEAN SCORE	3.11	3.92	4.13	5.24	5.46	6.66	7.39	7.53

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Significant: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One
R2 = Replicate Two
R3 = Replicate Three
R4 = Replicate Four

TABLE 27

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST AMONG MEAN SCORES FOR THE INTERACTION OF SIGN BY REPLICATE ON FACTOR 4

SIGN	POS	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	POS	NEG	NEG
REPLICATE	R3	R4	R1	R3	R1	R2	R4	R2
MEAN SCORE	1.74	2.18	2.67	3.52	4.00	5.79	5.89	6.63

*Any two means not underlined by the same line differ significantly at the p <.05 level.

Significant: POS = POSITIVE
NEG = NEGATIVE

Replicate: R1 = Replicate One
R2 = Replicate Two
R3 = Replicate Three
R4 = Replicate Four

BEST COPY AVAILABLE